

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Initially, Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for allowing claims 9, 11-13, 15 and 16, and for indicating the allowance of claims 17-28 if amended to overcome the 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, rejection.

Initially, the Examiner objects to claims 19, 22, 25 and 28 under 37 C.F.R. 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Specifically, the Examiner states that the claims reverse the steps as set forth in the independent claim from which they depend, because independent claims 17, 20, 23 and 26 recite that the insulating film covers the pixel electrode, while dependent claims 19, 22, 25 and 28 recite that the pixel electrode is formed on the insulating film.

In response, the last step in independent claims 17, 20, 23 and 26 have been amended to recite that an insulating *layer* covers the pixel electrode, and dependent claims 19, 22, 25 and 28 have been amended to recite that the pixel electrode is formed on the *gate* insulating film. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objection of claims 19, 22, 25 and 28 under 37 C.F.R. 1.75(c).

The Examiner rejects claims 17-28 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Specifically, the Examiner states that claims 17, 20 and 26 are inconsistent with the specification and figures because Figs. 13 and 14 disclose the pixel edge section is formed at the same time with the signal lines. In response, Applicants have amended claims 17, 20 and 26 to recite the step of forming the pixel edge section in the same step as the forming of the first and second signal lines.

Further, the Examiner states the same issue above applies to claim 23 for the cut-out portion of the pixel electrode. In response, Applicants have amended claim 23 to recite that the pixel edge section is formed in the same step as the forming of the cut-out portion.

Additionally, the Examiner states that it is unclear what the difference is between the method of claim 20 and claim 26 except for the preambles. Applicants respectfully submit that claim 20 recites forming only one first signal line and one second signal line along with one pixel electrode, and claim 26 recites forming a plurality of pixel electrodes along with first and second signal lines.

Finally, the Examiner states that it is unclear why the preamble of claim 26 recites a “bending” portion, but step (c) recites a “projecting” portion. In response, Applicants have amended the preamble of claim 26 to recite a “projecting” portion to be consistent with step (c).

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 17-28 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, and respectfully submit that the claims are now allowable.

The Examiner rejects claims 1, 3, 5 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,502,583 to Sukegawa et al. (hereinafter “Sukegawa”). Claims 4 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly obvious over Sukegawa in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,682,211 to Yao et al. (hereinafter “Yao”).

In response, claims 1, 3, 4, 5, 7 and 8 are currently cancelled; therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection is moot. Claims 2 and 6 were previously cancelled. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request allowance of claims 9, 11-13 and 15-28.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this application be allowed and a Notice

of Allowance issued. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference with Applicants' attorney would be advantageous to the disposition of this case, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

PDW
Paul J. Esatto, Jr.
Registration No. 30,749

SCULLY, SCOTT, MURPHY & PRESSER
400 Garden City Plaza
Garden City, New York 11530
(516) 742-4343

PJE:AVS:jap